arXiv:quant-ph/0409128v1 20 Sep 2004

On the representation of contextual probabilistic dynamics in the complex Hilbert space: linear and nonlinear evolutions, Schrödinger dynamics

Andrei Khrennikov*
MSI, University of Växjö, S-35195, Sweden

Abstract

We constructed the representation of contextual probabilistic dynamics in the complex Hilbert space. Thus dynamics of the wave function can be considered as Hilbert space projections of realistic dynamics in a "prespace". The basic condition for representing of the prespace-dynamics is the law of statistical conservation of energy – conservation of probabilities. Construction of the dynamical representation is an important step in the development of contextual statistical viewpoint to quantum processes. But the contextual statistical model is essentially more general than the quantum one. Therefore in general the Hilbert space projection of the "prespace" dynamics can be nonlinear and even irreversible (but it is always unitary). There were found conditions of linearity and reversibility of the Hilbert space dynamical projection. We also found conditions for the conventional Schrödinger dynamics (including time-dependent Hamiltonians). We remark that in general even the Schrödinger dynamics is based just on the statistical conservation of energy; for individual systems the law of conservation of energy can be violated (at least in our theoretical model).

---

[*] International Center for Mathematical Modeling in Physics and Cognitive Sciences, Email: Andrei.Khrennikov@msi.vxu.se; supported by EU-Network "QP and Applications" and Nat. Sc. Found., grant N PHY99-07949 at KITP, Santa-Barbara.

1 Introduction

In a series of papers [1]-[3] there was demonstrated that by using a so called *contextual approach* to classical probabilities we can construct a representation of the conventional measure-theoretical probabilistic model in a complex Hilbert.[1] This representation is based on an interference generalization of the well known formula of total probability [4]. In quantum physics this generalization is known as the formula of *interference of probabilities.* In the opposite to the conventional quantum theory, we obtain interference of probabilities in the classical (but contextual) probabilistic framework, i.e., without to appeal to the Hilbert space formalism. Starting with the interference formula of total probability we represent some class of contexts (so called trigonometric contexts) by probabilistic complex amplitudes and the famous Born's rule takes place. In the abstract form this representation coincides with the conventional quantum (Hilbert space) representation. Our representation is based on a pair of realistic variables (Kolmogorovian random variables) a and b; so called *reference observables.* These realistic observables are naturally represented by self-adjoint operators $\hat{a}, \hat{b}$ in the complex Hilbert space. It is amazing that these operators corresponding to ordinary random variables do not commute. Of course, the reference random variables should be chosen in a special way. They should be *incompatible.* But incompatibility of random variables is defined in classical probabilistic (measure-theoretical) terms.

We remark that not all contexts can be represented by complex probabilistic amplitudes. For example, there exist contexts inducing so called *hyperbolic interference of probabilities.* Such contexts are represented by probabilistic amplitudes which take values in the two dimensional Clifford algebra ("algebra of hyperbolic numbers"), see [1]–[3].

So in our approach there exists prequantum reality which can be described by using the classical (contextual) probability theory. A part of this reality can be represented in the quantum-like way (or one can say: projected on the complex Hilbert space). There are many ways to represent the prequantum probabilistic model in the complex Hilbert space. Every representation is based on a pair of observables. And that is the point! In opposition to common considerations, see, e.g.,

---

[1] Here context is a complex of physical conditions. The contextual approach is based on just one postulate: *all probabilities depend on complexes of physical conditions.* It is meaningless to speak about probability without to specify a context.

J. von Neumann [5], in our model only two special observables are realistic. Therefore there are no problems with no-go theorems: von Neumann, Kochen-Specker, Bell,...

In this paper on the basis of results of [1]-[3] we consider the representation in the complex Hilbert space of realistic dynamics for the reference variables. The basic assumption for the existence of such a representation is the validity of the *law of conservation of probabilities* for one of the reference observables, e.g., a. In particular, we can consider a as the *energy variable* and b as the *position variable.* However, in general our scheme of representation is more general and it can be applied to all physical quantities with conservation of probabilities. We emphasize that we do not assume conservation of these quantities (e.g., the energy) for individual systems. In particular, the law of conservation of energy can be violated for some prequantum realistic dynamics (so we should distinguish the laws of statistical conservation of energy and individual conservation of energy).

Another unexpected feature of our model is that dynamics in the complex Hilbert space (representing prequantum realistic dynamics) can be *nonlinear.* We found conditions of linearity of the Hilbert space image of a prequantum dynamics. We remark that the Hilbert space dynamics is always unitary (both in the linear and nonlinear cases).

We also emphasize that in general the Hilbert space image of prequantum dynamics can be *irreversible.* We found conditions of reversibility. Finally, we found conditions which induce the conventional Schrödinger dynamics: linear reversible unitary dynamics. The Schrödinger dynamics is characterized through dynamics of the interference coefficient (coefficient of statistical disturbance) which appears in the interference formula of total probability. Dynamics of this coefficient should be described by the differential equation for *harmonic oscillator.*

2 Contextual viewpoint to classical probability and interference of probabilities

In this section we repeat the main points of contextual measure-theoretical approach to interference of probabilities, see [1]–[3] for details.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ be a Kolmogorov probability space.[2] By the standard Kolmogorov axiomatics sets $A \in \mathcal{F}$ represent *events.* In our simplest model of *contextual probability* (which can be called the Kolmogorov contextual model) the same system of sets $\mathcal{F}$ is used to represent complexes of experimental physical conditions – *contexts.* The conditional probability is mathematically defined by the Bayes' formula: $\mathbf{P}(A/C) = \mathbf{P}(AC)/\mathbf{P}(C), \mathbf{P}(C) \neq 0$. In our contextual model this probability has the meaning of the probability of occurrence of the event A under the complex of physical conditions C.

---

[2] This is a measure-theoretical model. Here Ω is an arbitrary set, $\mathcal{F}$ is a σ-field of

Let $a = a_1, ..., a_n$ and $b = b_1, ..., b_n$ be discrete random variables. Then the classical *formula of total probability* holds, see, e.g., [4]:

$$\mathbf{P}(b = b_i/C) = \sum_n \mathbf{P}(a = a_n/C)\mathbf{P}(b = b_i/a = a_n, C) \ . \tag{1}$$

We remark that sets (belonging to $\mathcal{F}$) :

$$B_x = \{\omega \in \Omega : b(\omega) = x\} \text{ and } A_y = \{\omega \in \Omega : a(\omega) = y\} \tag{2}$$

have two different interpretations. On the one hand, these sets represent events corresponding to occurrence of the values $b = x$ and $a = y$, respectively. On the other hand, they represent contexts (complexes of physical conditions) corresponding to selections of physical systems with respect to values $b = x$ and $a = y$, respectively. The main problem with the formula of total probability is that in general it is impossible to construct a context "A_yC" corresponding to a selection with respect to the value $a = y$ which would not disturb systems prepared by the context C : only in the absence of disturbances induced by measurements we can use the set theoretical operation of intersection. I would like to modify the formula of total probability by eliminating from consideration sets "A_yC" which in general do not represent physically realizable contexts.

A set C belonging to $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be a *non degenerate context* with respect to the a-variable if $\mathbf{P}(A_yC) \neq 0$ for all y. We denote the set of such contexts by the symbol $\mathcal{C}_{a,\text{nd}}$. Let a, b be two random variables. They are said to be *incompatible* if $\mathbf{P}(B_xA_y) \neq 0$ for all their values x and y. Thus a and b are incompatible iff every B_x is a non degenerate context with respect to a, $B_x \in \mathcal{C}_{a,\text{nd}}$, and vice versa

---

subsets of Ω and $\mathbf{P}$ is a normalized countably additive measure on $\mathcal{F}$ taking values in $[0, 1]$ (Kolmogorov probability). Physical observables are represented by random variables – (measurable) functions on Ω.

We shall consider the case of *incompatible dichotomous random variables* $a = a_1, a_2, b = b_1, b_2$. We set

$$Y = \{a_1, a_2\}, X = \{b_1, b_2\}$$

("spectra" of random variables a and b). In [1]–[3] there was proved the following interference formula of total probability (generalizing the classical formula of total probability).

$$\mathbf{P}(b = x/C) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \mathbf{P}(a = a_j/C)\mathbf{P}(B/a = a_j)$$

$$+2\lambda(b = x/a, C)\sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{2} \mathbf{P}(a = a_j/C)\mathbf{P}(b = x/a = a_j)},$$

where $\lambda(b = x/a, C)$

$$= \frac{\mathbf{P}(/C) - \sum_{j=1}^{2} \mathbf{P}(b = x/a = a_j)\mathbf{P}(a = a_j/C)}{2\sqrt{\mathbf{P}(a = a_1/C)\mathbf{P}(b = x/a_1)\mathbf{P}(a = a_2/C)\mathbf{P}(b = x/a = a_2)}}$$

To obtain this formula, we put the expression for λ into the sum and obtain identity. In fact, this formula is just a representation of the probability $\mathbf{P}(b = x/C)$ in a special way. The $\lambda(b = x/a, C)$ was called the *coefficients of statistical disturbance* [1]–[3] or the coefficient of incompatibility of observables a and b.

Suppose that, for every $x \in X$, $|\lambda(b = x/a, C)| \leq 1$. In this case we can introduce new statistical parameters $\theta(b = x/a, C) \in [0, 2\pi]$ and represent the coefficients of statistical disturbance in the trigonometric form: $\lambda(b = x/a, C) = \cos\theta(b = x/a, C)$. Parameters $\theta(b = x/a, C)$ are called *relative phases* of the events $B_x = \{\omega \in \Omega : b(\omega) = x\}$ with respect to the observable a (in the context C); or simply *probabilistic phases*. We remark that in general there is no geometry behind these phases; these are purely probabilistic parameters. By using the trigonometric representation of the coefficients λ we obtain the well known *formula of interference of probabilities* which is typically derived by using the Hilbert space formalism. [3]

---

[3] If both coefficients λ are larger than one, we can represent them as $\lambda(b = x/a, C) = \pm\cosh\theta(b = x/a, C)$ and obtain the formula of hyperbolic interference of probabilities, see [1]–[3]; there can also be found models with the mixed hyper-trigonometric behaviour, see [1]–[3].

3 Representation of the contextual classical probabilistic model in the Hilbert space

We recall that we consider the case of incompatible dichotomous random variables $a = a_1, a_2, b = b_1, b_2$. This pair of variables will be fixed. We call such variables **reference variables.** For each pair a, b of reference variables we construct a representation of the contextual Kolmogorov model in the Hilbert space ("quantum-like representation"). In this paper we shall be interested only in the representation of trigonometric contexts:

$$\mathcal{C}^{\rm tr} = \{C \in \mathcal{C}_{\rm a,nd} : |\lambda(b = x/a, c)| \leq 1, x \in X\}$$

Of course, the system $\mathcal{C}^{\rm tr}$ depends on the choice of a pair of reference observables, $\mathcal{C}^{\rm tr} \equiv \mathcal{C}^{\rm tr}_{b/a}$ We set $p^a_C(y) = \mathbf{P}(a = y/C), p^b_C(x) = \mathbf{P}(b = x/C), p(x/y) = \mathbf{P}(b = x/a = y), x \in X, y \in Y$. Let $C \in \mathcal{C}^{\rm tr}$. The interference formula of total probability can be written in the following form:

$$p^b_c(x) = \sum_{y \in Y} p^a_C(y) p(x/y) + 2 \cos \theta_C(x) \sqrt{\Pi_{y \in Y} p^a_C(y) p(x/y)}\ , \qquad (3)$$

where $\theta_C(x) = \theta(b = x/a, C) = \pm \arccos \lambda(b = x/a, C), x \in X$. By using the elementary formula:

$$D = A + B + 2\sqrt{AB} \cos \theta = |\sqrt{A} + e^{i\theta} \sqrt{B}|^2, \qquad (4)$$

for $A, B > 0, \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, we can represent the probability $p^b_C(x)$ as the square of the complex amplitude (Born's rule):

$$p^b_C(x) = |\varphi_C(x)|^2, \qquad (5)$$

where a complex probability amplitude is defined (through (3) and (4)) by

$$\varphi(x) \equiv \varphi_C(x) = \sqrt{p^a_C(a_1) p(x/a_1)} + e^{i\theta_C(x)} \sqrt{p^a_C(a_2) p(x/a_2)}\ . \qquad (6)$$

We denote the space of functions: $\varphi : X \to \mathbf{C}$ by the symbol $\Phi = \Phi(X, \mathbf{C})$. Since $X = \{b_1, b_2\}$, the Φ is the two dimensional complex linear space. By using the representation (6) we construct the map

$$J^{b/a} : \mathcal{C} \to \Phi(X, \mathbf{C}) \qquad (7)$$

The $J^{b/a}$ maps contexts (complexes of, e.g., physical conditions) into complex amplitudes. The representation (5) of probability is nothing other than the famous **Born rule.** The complex amplitude $\varphi_C(x)$ can be called a **wave function** of the complex of physical conditions, context C or a (pure) *state.* [4] We set $e^b_x(\cdot) = \delta(x - \cdot)$. The Born's rule for complex amplitudes (5) can be rewritten in the following form:

$$p^b_C(x) = |(\varphi_C, e^b_x)|^2 \ , \tag{8}$$

where the scalar product in the space $\Phi(X, C)$ is defined by the standard formula: $(\varphi, \psi) = \sum_{x \in X} \varphi(x)\bar{\psi}(x)$. The system of functions $\{e^b_x\}_{x \in X}$ is an orthonormal basis in the Hilbert space $H = (\Phi, (\cdot, \cdot))$

Let $X \subset R$. By using the Hilbert space representation (8) of the Born's rule we obtain the Hilbert space representation of the expectation of the (Kolmogorovian) random variable b:

$$E(b/C) = \sum_{x \in X} x|\varphi_C(x)|^2 = \sum_{x \in X} x(\varphi_C, e^b_x)\overline{(\varphi_C, e^b_x)} = (\hat{b}\varphi_C, \varphi_C) \ , \tag{9}$$

where the (self-adjoint) operator $\hat{b} : E \to E$ is determined by its eigenvectors: $\hat{b}e^b_x = xe^b_x, x \in X$. This is the multiplication operator in the space of complex functions $\Phi(X, \mathbf{C}) : \hat{b}\varphi(x) = x\varphi(x)$ By (9) the conditional expectation of the Kolmogorovian random variable b is represented with the aid of the self-adjoint operator $\hat{b}$. Therefore it is natural to represent this random variable (in the Hilbert space model) by the operator $\hat{b}$. We would like to have Born's rule not only for the b-variable, but also for the a-variable:

$$p^a_C(y) = |(\varphi, e^a_y)|^2 \ , y \in Y. \tag{10}$$

How can we define the basis $\{e^a_y\}$ corresponding to the a-observable? Such a basis can be found starting with interference of probabilities. We set $u^a_j = \sqrt{p^a_C(a_j)}, u^b_j = \sqrt{p^b_C(b_j)}, p_{ij} = p(b_j/a_i), u_{ij} = \sqrt{p_{ij}}, \theta_j = \theta_C(b_j)$. We have:

$$\varphi_C = v^b_1 e^b_1 + v^b_2 e^b_2, \text{ where } \ v^b_j = u^a_1 u_{1j} + u^a_2 u_{2j} e^{i\theta_j} \ .$$

Hence

$$p^b_C(b_j) = |v^b_j|^2 = |u^a_1 u_{1j} + u^a_2 u_{2j} e^{i\theta_j}|^2. \tag{11}$$

---

[4] We underline that the complex linear space representation (6) of the set of contexts $\mathcal{C}$ is based on a pair (a, b) of incompatible (Kolmogorovian) random variables. Here $\varphi_C = \varphi_C^{b/a}$. We call random variables a, b **reference variables.**

This is the *interference representation of probabilities* that is used, e.g., in quantum formalism.

For any context C, we can represent the corresponding wave function $\varphi = \varphi_C$ in the form:

$$\varphi = u_1^a e_1^a + u_2^a e_2^a, \tag{12}$$

where

$$e_1^a = (u_{11}, \ \ u_{12}), \ \ e_2^a = (e^{i\theta_1} u_{21}, \ \ e^{i\theta_2} u_{22}) \tag{13}$$

We consider the *matrix of transition probabilities* $\mathbf{P}^{b/a} = (p_{ij})$. It is always a *stochastic matrix:* $p_{i1} + p_{i2} = 1, i = 1, 2)$. We remind that a matrix is called *double stochastic* if it is stochastic and, moreover, $p_{1j} + p_{2j} = 1, j = 1, 2$. The system $\{e_i^a\}$ of vectors corresponding to the a-observable is an orthonormal basis (and so the Born's rule holds true, see [3] for the details) iff the matrix $\mathbf{P}^{b/a}$ is double stochastic and probabilistic phases satisfy the constraint:

$$\theta_2 - \theta_1 = \pi \bmod 2\pi. \tag{14}$$

Theorem. [3] *We can construct the quantum-like (Hilbert space) representation of a contextual Kolmogorov space such that the Born's rule holds true for both reference variables iff the matrix of transition probabilities* $\mathbf{P}^{b/a}$ *is double stochastic.*

It will be always supposed that the $\mathbf{P}^{b/a}$ is double stochastic.

In this case the a-observable is represented by the operator $\hat{a}$ which is diagonal (with eigenvalues a_i) in the basis $\{e_i^a\}$. The Kolmogorovian conditional average of the random variable a coincides with the quantum Hilbert space average:

$$E(a/C) = \sum_{y \in Y} y p_C^a(y) = (\hat{a}\phi_C, \phi_C), \ C \in \mathcal{C}^{\text{tr}}.$$

4 Representation of contextual probabilistic dynamics in the complex Hilbert space

Let us assume that the reference observables a and b evolve with time:

$$a = a(t, \omega), \ \ b = b(t, \omega).$$

To simplify considerations, we consider evolutions which do not change ranges of values of the reference observables: $Y = \{a_1, a_2\}$ and $X = \{b_1, b_2\}$ do not depend on time. Thus, for any t, $a(t, \omega) \in Y$ and $b = b(t, \omega) \in X$. These are random walks with two-points state spaces Y and X. Since our main aim is the contextual probabilistic realistic reconstruction of QM, we should restrict our considerations to evolutions with the trigonometric interference. We proceed under the following assumption:

(CTRB) (Conservation of trigonometric behavior) *The set of trigonometric contexts does not depend on time:* $\mathcal{C}^{\rm tr}_{a(t)/b(t)} = \mathcal{C}^{\rm tr}_{a(t_0)/b(t_0)}$.

By (CTB) if a context $C \in \mathcal{C}^{\rm tr}_{a(t_0)/b(t_0)}$, i.e., at the initial instant of time the coefficients of statistical disturbance $|\lambda(b(t_0) = x/a(t_0), C)| \leq 1$, then the coefficients $\lambda(b(t) = x/a(t), C)$ will always fluctuate in the segment $[0, 1]$. [5]

For each instant of time t, we can use the formalism of contextual quantization, see (6): a context C can be represented by a complex probability amplitude:

$$\varphi(t, x) \equiv \varphi_C^{b(t)/a(t)}(x)$$

$$= \sqrt{p_C^{a(t)}(a_1) p^{b(t)/a(t)}(x/a_1)} + e^{i\theta_C^{b(t)/a(t)}(x)} \sqrt{p_C^{a(t)}(a_2) p^{b(t)/a(t)}(x/a_2)}.$$

We remark that the observable $a(t)$ is represented by the self-adjoint operator $\hat{a}(t)$ defined by its with eigenvectors:

$$e_1^a(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{p(t; b_1/a_1)} \\ \sqrt{p(t; b_2/a_1)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_2^a(t) = e^{i\theta_C(t)} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{p(t; b_1/a_2)} \\ -\sqrt{p(t; b_2/a_1)} \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$p(t; x/y) = p^{b(t)/a(t)}(x/y), \theta_C(t) = \theta_C^{b(t)/a(t)}(b_1)$$

and where we set $e_j^a(t) \equiv e_j^{a(t)}$. We recall that $\theta_C^{b(t)/a(t)}(b_2) = \theta_C^{b(t)/a(t)}(b_1) + \pi$, since the matrix of transition probabilities is assumed to be double stochastic for all instances of time.

---

[5] Of course, there can be considered more general dynamics in which the trigonometric probabilistic behaviour can be transformed into the hyperbolic one and vice versa. But we shall not try to study the most general dynamics. Our aim is to show that the conventional Schrödinger dynamics can be easily found among contextual dynamics in the complex Hilbert space.

We shall describe dynamics of the wave function $\varphi(t,x)$ starting with following assumptions (CP) and (CTP). Then these assumptions will be completed by the set (a)-(b) of mathematical assumptions which will imply the conventional Schrödinger evolution.

(CP)(Conservation of a-probabilities) *The probability distribution of the a-observable is preserved in process of evolution:*

$$p_C^{a(t)}(y) = p_C^{a(t_0)}(y), y \in Y, \tag{15}$$

for any context $C \in \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{tr}}_{a(t_0)/b(t_0)}$. This statistical conservation of the a-quantity will have very important dynamical consequences. We also assume that the law of conservation of transition probabilities holds:

(CTP) (Conservation of transition probabilities) *Probabilities* $p(t;x/y)$ *are conserved in the process of evolution:*

$$p(t;x/y) = p(t_0;x/y) \equiv p(x/y). \tag{16}$$

Under the latter assumption we have:

$$e_1^a(t) \equiv e_1^a(t_0), e_2^a(t) = e^{i[\theta_C(t)-\theta_C(t_0)]} e_2^a(t_0). \tag{17}$$

Remark 4.1. If the $a(t)$-basis evolves according to (17), then $\hat{a}(t) = \hat{a}(t_0) = \hat{a}$. Hence the whole stochastic process $a(t,\omega)$ is represented by one fixed self-adjoint operator. We emphasize that random variables $a(t_1,\omega)$ and $a(t_2,\omega)$, $t_1 \neq t_2$, can differ essentially as functions of the random parameter ω. Nevertheless, they are represented by the same quantum operator.

Thus under assumptions (CTRB), (CP) and (CTP) we have:

$$\varphi(t) = u_1^a e_1^a(t) + u_2^a e_2^a(t) = u_1^a e_1^a(t_0) + e^{i\xi_C(t,t_0)} u_2^a e_2^a(t_0),$$

where $u_j^a = \sqrt{p_C^{a(t_0)}(a_j)}, j=1,2$, and

$$\xi_C(t,t_0) = \theta_C(t) - \theta_C(t_0).$$

Let us consider the unitary operator $\hat{U}(t,t_0) : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ defined by this transformation of basis: $e^a(t_0) \to e^a(t)$. In the basis $e^a(t_0) = \{e_1^a(t_0), e_2^a(t_0)\}$ the $\hat{U}(t,t_0)$ can be represented by the matrix:

$$\hat{U}(t,t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\xi_C(t,t_0)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We obtained the following dynamics in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$:

$$\varphi(t) = \hat{U}(t, t_0)\varphi(t_0) \tag{18}$$

This dynamics looks very similar to the Schrödinger dynamics in the Hilbert space. However, the dynamics (18) is essentially more general than Schrödinger's dynamics. In fact, the unitary operator $\hat{U}(t, t_0) = \hat{U}(t, t_0, C)$ depends on the context C, i.e., on the initial state $\varphi(t_0)$: $\hat{U}(t, t_0) \equiv \hat{U}(t, t_0, \varphi(t_0))$. So, in fact, we derived the following dynamical equation:

$$\varphi(t) = \hat{U}(t, t_0, \varphi_0)\varphi_0, \tag{19}$$

where, for any $\varphi_0, \hat{U}(t, t_0, \varphi_0)$ is a family of unitary operators.

The conditions (CTRB), (CP) and (CTP) are natural from the physical viewpoint (if the a-observable is considered as an analog of energy, see further considerations). But these conditions do not imply that the Hilbert space image of the contextual realistic dynamics is a linear unitary dynamics.

In general the Hilbert space projection of the realistic prequantum dynamics is nonlinear.

To obtain a linear dynamics, we should make the following assumption:

(CI) (Context independence of the increment of the probabilistic phase) *The* $\xi_C(t, t_0) = \theta_C(t) - \theta_C(t_0)$ *does not depend on* C.

Under this assumption the unitary operator $\hat{U}(t, t_0)$ does not depend on C.

$$\hat{U}(t, t_0) = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\xi(t, t_0)} \end{array} \right). \tag{20}$$

Thus the equation (18) is the equation of the linear unitary evolution. The main problem in these considerations is to find a physical basis of the condition (CI): the increment of statistical disturbance should be the same for all contexts, see section 5 for the detailed analysis. The linear unitary evolution (18) is still essentially more general than the conventional Schrödinger dynamics. To obtain the Schrödinger evolution, we need a few standard mathematical assumptions:

(a). Dynamics is continuous: the map $(t, t_0) \to \hat{U}(t, t_0)$ is continuous.[6]

---

[6] We recall that there is considered the finite dimensional case. Thus there is no problem of the choice of topology.

(b). Dynamics is deterministic.

(c). Dynamics is invariant with respect to time-shifts; $\hat{U}(t,t_0)$ depends only on $t-t_0 : \hat{U}(t,t_0) \equiv \hat{U}(t-t_0)$.

The assumption of determinism can be described by the following relation:

$$\phi(t;t_0,\phi_0) = \phi(t;t_1,\phi(t_1;t_0,\phi_0)),\ t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t,$$

where $\phi(t;t_0,\phi_0) = \hat{U}(t,t_0)\phi_0$.

It is well known that under the assumptions (a), (b), (c) the family of (linear) unitary operators $\hat{U}(t,t_0)$ corresponds to the one parametric group of unitary operators:

$$\hat{U}(t) = e^{-\frac{i}{h}\hat{H}t}, \tag{21}$$

where $\hat{H} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is a self-adjoint operator. Here $h > 0$ is a scaling factor (e.g., the Planck constant). We have:

$$\hat{H} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & E \end{array} \right), \tag{22}$$

where

$$E = -h\Big[\frac{\theta_C(t) - \theta_C(t_0)}{t-t_0}\Big].$$

Hence the Schrödinger evolution in the complex Hilbert space corresponds to the contextual probabilistic dynamics with the linear evolution of the probabilistic phase:

$$\theta_C(t) = \theta_C(t_0) - \frac{E}{h}(t-t_0). \tag{23}$$

Let us consider a stochastic process (rescaling of the process $a(t,\omega)$) :

$$H(t,\omega) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0, & a(t,\omega) = a_1 \\ E, & a(t,\omega) = a_2. \end{array} \right. \tag{24}$$

Since the probability distributions of the processes $a(t,\omega))$ and $H(t,\omega)$ coincide (up to rescaling of ranges of values), we have

$$p_C^{H(t)}(0) = p_C^{a(t)}(a_1) \equiv p_C^{a(t_0)}(a_1) = p_C^{H(t_0)}(0) \tag{25}$$

$$p_C^{H(t)}(E) = p_C^{a(t)}(a_2) \equiv p_C^{a(t_0)}(a_2) = p_C^{H(t_0)}(E). \tag{26}$$

If $E > 0$ we can interpret $H(t, \omega)$ as the energy observable and the operator $\hat{H}$ as its Hilbert space image. We emphasize, see Remark 4.1, that the whole "energy process" $H(t, \omega)$ is represented by a single self-adjoint nonnegative operator $\hat{H}$ in the Hilbert space. This operator, "quantum Hamiltonian", is the Hilbert space projection of the energy process which is defined on the "prespace" Ω, see [3]. In principle, random variables $H(t_1, \omega), H(t_2, \omega), t_1 \neq t_2$, can be very different (as functions of ω). We have only the law of *statistical conservation of energy:*

$$p_C^{H(t)}(z) \equiv p_C^{H(t_0)}(z), \; z = 0, E. \tag{27}$$

In general (depending on dynamics of the coefficient of the statistical disturbance) the eigenvalue E need not be positive. So in general we have a dynamical equation corresponding to some statistically conserved quantity, see, e.g., [] for details. Of course, the representation (21) is equivalent to the Schrödinger equation:

$$ih \frac{d\hat{U}}{dt}(t) = \hat{H}\hat{U}(t), \;\; \hat{U}(0) = I,$$

where I is the unit operator.

5 Characterization of Schrödinger dynamics through dynamics of the coefficients of statistical disturbance

We discuss here consequences of the condition (CI) for the measurable quantity, namely, the coefficient of statistical disturbance:

$$\lambda_C(t) \equiv \lambda(b(t) = b_1/a(t), C) = \cos \theta_C(t).$$

By (CI) we have $\theta_C(t) - \theta_C(t_0) = q(t, t_0)$, where q does not depend on C. Thus $\theta'_C(t) = q'(t, t_0) \equiv f(t, t_0)$ does not depend on C. We remark that in principle $f(t, t_0)$ can depend on t_0, see Remark 5.2 for details. Let us investigate an interesting special case:

(DT) *The function f does not depend on t_0.*

Here $f = f(t)$. Suppose that $f(t)$ is a continuous function. Hence $\theta_C(t) = \theta_C(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t f(s) ds$ and

$$\lambda_C(t) = \cos[\theta_C(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^t f(s) ds].$$

We have the following differential equation for the coefficient $\lambda_C(t)$:

$$\lambda_C'(t) = \pm f(t)\sqrt{1-\lambda_C^2(t)}. \tag{28}$$

To find the coefficient of statistical disturbance (under above assumptions), one should solve the Cauchy problem for the differential equation (28)with the initial condition

$$\lambda_C(t_0) = \lambda(b(t_0) = b_1/a(t_0), C) \equiv \cos\theta_C(t_0). \tag{29}$$

In this case the assumption (CI) can be written in the form of the Cauchy problem (28), (29). The evolution family has the form:

$$\hat{U}(t,t_0) = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\int_{t_0}^t f(s)ds} \end{array} \right). \tag{30}$$

This evolution is continuous and deterministic. To prove that the condition of determinism (b) holds, we use the additivity of integral. In general such evolutions are not invariant with respect to time-shifts; they correspond to Schrödinger evolutions with time dependent generators:

$$ih\frac{d\hat{U}(t,t_0)}{dt} = \hat{H}(t)\hat{U}(t,t_0),\ \hat{U}(t_0,t_0) = I,$$

where

$$\hat{H}(t) = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & E(t) \end{array} \right), \tag{31}$$

where $E(t) = -hf(t)$. Let us consider two very simple, but illustrative examples.

Example 1. (Schrödinger dynamics) Let $f(t) = -E/h = \text{Const}$. Then $\theta_C(t) = \theta_0 - E(t-t_0)/h$. Here

$$\hat{U}(t) = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\frac{Et}{h}} \end{array} \right).$$

This is the Schrödinger dynamics; so here the conditions (a)-(c) are automatically satisfied. We remark that in this case the coefficient of statistical disturbance satisfies the second order differential equation, namely, the equation for *harmonic oscillations:*

$$\frac{d^2\lambda}{dt^2}(t) + \omega^2\lambda(t) = 0, \tag{32}$$

where $\omega = E/h$. This is the direct consequence of the representation $\lambda(t) = \cos[\theta_0 - E(t - t_0)/h]$. Hence:

The Schrödinger dynamics is characterized by the harmonic fluctuations of the coefficient of statistical disturbance.

Example 2. Let $f(t) = -Et/h, E > 0$. Here $\theta_C(t) = \theta_C(t_0) - E(t^2 - t_0^2)/2h$ and

$$\hat{U}(t, t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-iE(t^2 - t_0^2)/2h} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is a linear unitary deterministic and continuous dynamics, but it is not invariant with respect to time-shifts. This is the Schrödinger dynamics with time-dependent generator of evolution. The $\hat{H}(t)$ is positively defined and it can be considered as time dependent Hamiltonian.

Remark 5.1. (Approximate reversibility of the Hilbert space evolution) If the function $f = f(t, t_0)$ depends nontrivially on t_0, then the evolution of the wave function is not deterministic. It is *irreversible.* We remark that if determinism of the evolution of the probabilistic phase is violated, then $f(t, t_0)$ nontrivially depends on t_0 (and vice versa). The violation of determinism for the phase evolution means that $\theta_C(t)$ is not uniquely determined by $\theta_C(t_0)$; so the following condition of determinism:

$$\theta_C(t; \theta_C(t_1; \theta_C(t_0))) = \theta_C(t; \theta_C(t_0))$$

should be violated, $t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t$. Here $\theta_C(t; \theta_C(t_0))$ is the probabilistic phase at the instant of time t under the condition that it was equal to $\theta_C(t_0)$ at the initial instant of time t_0. We remark that reversible Hilbert space evolutions could appear as approximations of irreversible Hilbert space evolutions. Suppose that

$$f(t, t_0) = f(t) + \epsilon f_1(t, t_0),$$

where ϵ is negligibly small. Then by neglecting terms of the ϵ-magnitude we can approximately describe the Hilbert space evolution as reversible. Of course, there should be chosen some scale. It is natural to use the scale based on the Planck constant h. Thus if $\epsilon << h$, then the irreversible evolution

$$\hat{U}(t, t_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i[\int_{t_0}^{t} f(s)ds + \epsilon \int_{t_0}^{t} f_1(t, t_0)ds]} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{33}$$

can be approximately considered as the reversible evolution (21).

Remark 5.2. (Approximate linearity of the Hilbert space evolution) Arguments which are similar to the arguments of the previous Remark can be applied to the problem of linearization of general nonlinear dynamics in the complex Hilbert space. Let $f = f(t)$ (so dynamics is deterministic) and let $f(t)$ be an analytic function:

$$f(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n t^n \equiv f_0 + f_1(t).$$

Suppose that

$$\epsilon = \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |f_1(t)| << h.$$

If $\epsilon << h$, then the Hilbert space dynamics could be approximately considered as a linear dynamics.

We also can combine arguments of both Remarks.

Conclusion. *A contextual realistic dynamics can be represented (under assumptions (CTRB), (CP), and (CTP)) as a unitary dynamics in the complex Hilbert space. In general such a dynamics is nonlinear and irreversible. Dynamics is linear iff the condition (CI) holds. The contextual dynamics in the Hilbert space is reduced to the conventional Schrödinger evolution under the additional assumptions (a)-(c). In particular, the assumption (b) is implies reversibily. The Schrödinger dynamics is the Hilbert space projection of the realistic dynamics with harmonic oscillations, see (32), of the coefficient of statistical disturbance. It might be that the reversible and linear Schrödinger dynamics is just an approximation of an irreversible and nonlinear dynamics in the Hilbert space.*

The author of this paper was strongly influenced by investigations on various aspects of the conditional probabilistic approach to quantum mechanics; especially important role was played by works [6]–[16]; some elements of models presented in these works were used in the process of creation of the present contextual statistical model.

References

1. 1. A. Yu. Khrennikov, *J. Phys.A: Math. Gen.* **34**, 9965 (2001);*J. Math. Phys.***44**, 2471 (2003); *Phys. Lett. A* **316**, 279 (2003);

2. A. Yu. Khrennikov,"On foundations of quantum theory," in *Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations*, A. Yu. Khrennikov, ed. (Växjö University Press, 2002), pp. 163-173.

3. A. Yu. Khrennikov, *Annalen der Physik* **12**, 575 (2003); "On the classical limit for the hyperbolic quantum mechanics," quant-ph/0401035; *J. Math. Phys.*, **45**, 902 (2004)

4. A. N. Shiryayev, *Probability* (Springer, New York-Berlin-Heidelberg, 1984).

5. J. von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1955).

6. L. Accardi, Phys. Rep. **77**, 169(1981); "The probabilistic roots of the quantum mechanical paradoxes," in *The wave–particle dualism: A tribute to Louis de Broglie on his 90th Birthday*, S. Diner, D. Fargue, G. Lochak, and F. Selleri, eds. (D. Reidel Publ. Company, Dordrecht, 1984), pp. 47-55.

7. L. Accardi, *Urne e Camaleoni: Dialogo sulla realta, le leggi del caso e la teoria quantistica* (Il Saggiatore, Rome, 1997).

8. L. Accardi, A. Fedullo, Lettere al Nuovo Cimento **34,** 161-172 (1982).

9. L. E. Ballentine, Rev. Mod. Phys. **42**, 358 (1970); *Quantum mechanics* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1989); "Interpretations of probability and quantum theory," Q. Prob. White Noise Anal. **13**, 71 (2001).

10. L. E. Ballentine, *Quantum mechanics* (WSP, Singapore, 1998).

11. W. M. De Muynck, "Interpretations of quantum mechanics, and interpretations of violations of Bell's inequality", Q. Prob. White Noise Anal. **13**, 95 (2001).

12. W. M. De Muynck, *Foundations of quantum mechanics, an empiricists approach* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2002).

13. S. P. Gudder, Trans. AMS **119**, 428 (1965); *Axiomatic quantum mechanics and generalized probability theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1970).

14. S. P. Gudder, "An approach to quantum probability," Quantum Prob. White Noise Anal. **13**, 147 (2001).

15. A. Landé, *Foundations of quantum theory* (Yale Univ. Press, 1955); *New foundations of quantum mechanics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1968).

16. G. W. Mackey, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics* (W. A. Benjamin INc, New York, 1963).